

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 7-16 and 18-20 remain. Claims 1, 12 and 19 are amended to clarify the claimed invention. The Examiner rejected claims 1, 3, 4, 5, 8, 11-14 as anticipated by Adair and claims 1-5, 7-16 and 18 as obvious in view of Adair or Mackin in view of Wakabayashi. Applicants submit that neither Adair, Mackin or Wakabayashi alone or in combination depict or describe the claimed inventions. As a result, Applicants request the Examiner to withdraw the rejections.

Further, the Examiner rejected claims 19 and 20 as obvious in view of Adair or Mackin in view of Wakabayashi and further in view of Marks. Applicants submit that the Examiner has not identified a specific suggestion, motivation, or teaching as to why one of ordinary skill in the art would have been motivated to select the references and combine them. Adair, Mackin and Wakabayashi make no mention of septal defect and Marks does not discuss the use of a scope in connection with its septal defect repair system. Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has not met this burden, and further submit that even if the references are combined as the Examiner has done, the combination does not describe the elements of the amended claims. As a result, Applicants respectfully request that the obviousness rejection be withdrawn.

The Examiner's attention is drawn to the related patents described in the amended related applications paragraph.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 

Brian S. Tomko
Reg. No. 41,349

Johnson & Johnson
One Johnson & Johnson Plaza
New Brunswick, NJ 08933-7003
(732) 524-1239
Dated: February 17, 2005